COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 1 of 4

| Command: | Division: | Chapter | M |
|---------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Tracy (266) | Valley | 6 | |
| Inspected by: | | Date: | of the to |
| G. Burlingame | , Sergeant | 02/02/2010 | |

| INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, cor | Inspection docume | on number. Under "Forw ent shall be utilized to do | vard to:" enter the nex cument innovative pra | |
|--|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Total hours expended on the inspection: 9 Hours | | ☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included | | |
| Follow-up Required: | Duo Data: 01/15/10 | | | |
| Chapter Inspection: 6 Inspector's Comments Regar None identified. | ding Ir | novative Practices | ;; | |
| Command Suggestions for Stone identified. | atewid | le Improvement: | | |
| Inspector's Findings: | | | | |
| code of 657. This was of 2. During several of the Gr | correct ant ov uring a | ted during the Uniforer time, officers fain RDO. Area supe | ormed Overtime led to list in the ervision/manage | note section of the 415 that the ement will ensure upon review of |
| Commander's Response: 🗵 | Concu | r or 🗌 Do Not Con | cur (Do Not Conc | ur shall document basis for response) |

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

FXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

'age 2 of 4

| Command: | Division: | Chapter: |
|----------------|-----------|------------|
| Tracy (266) | Valley | 6 |
| Inspected by: | <u></u> | Date: |
| G. Burlingame, | Sergeant | 02/02/2010 |

| Inspector's Comments: | Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, |
|-----------------------|---|
| etc.) | |

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

FXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 3 of 4

| Command: | Division: | Chapter: |
|---------------|------------|------------|
| Tracy (266) | Valley | 6 |
| Inspected by: | | Date: |
| G. Burlingame | , Sergeant | 02/02/2010 |

| | | | | 1.1 |
|--|----------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Required Action | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Corrective Action Plan/Timeline | | | | |
| For the minor discrepancies identi needed. | fied a briefing item | n was prepared or | n 02/04/2010. | No further action |
| | | | | |

| | // | |
|---|-----------------------|--------|
| Employee would like to discuss this report with | COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE | DATE , |
| the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.) | Arday | 2.4/10 |
| | INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE | DATE |
| k | D. Burlingame | 2-4-10 |
| | // | |

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

'age 4 of 4

| Commend | I Division | | , |
|----------------|------------|------------|---|
| Command: | Division: | Chapter: | İ |
| Tracy (266) | Valley | 6 | |
| Inspected by: | | Date: | T |
| G. Burlingame, | Sergeant | 02/02/2010 | |

| | | | Ø a | | |
|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------|-----|--|
| | | | 7 | | Market States September 1997 Water States St |
| Reviewer disci | ussed this report with | REVIEWER'S SIGN | ATURE // | | DATE / |
| employee | , | | / <i>k</i> | (m) | |
| ⊠ Concur | D | | £ 1 | | 1 . 1 . 1 |
| ∠ Concu | | 1/11/20 | -1/- I | | 6/4/10 |
| | | | 7 | | |

OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Grant Management

| Command: | Division: | Number: |
|----------------|------------|---------|
| Tracy (266) | VALLEY | ļ |
| Evaluated by: | Date: | |
| G. Burlingame, | 02/02/2010 | |
| Assisted by: | Date: | |
| | | |

| discret Furthe | pancies and/or deficiencies s rmore, the Exceptions Docu | al items with "Yes" or "No" answencies noted in the inspections sha shall be documented on an Excep ment shall include any follow-up a on" box shall be marked and only | II be comme tions Docun and/or corre | ented on via nent and ad ctive action/ | the "Rema dressed to (s) taken it | rks" section. Additionally, such the next level of command. |
|-------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | |
| TYPE (| OF INSPECTION | | Lead Insp | ector's Signa | iture: | |
| | rision Level | Command Level | A | - Biv | Umĝo | mi. |
| | ecutive Office Level | ं । Voluntary Self-Inspection | | | • / | |
| F.C | ollow-up Required: ☐ Yes ☐ No | ☐ Follow-up Inspection | Command | ler's Signatur | -€: | Date: |
| | oplicable policy, refer to | | | | | |
| Note: | If a "No" or "N/A" box is cl | necked, the "Remarks" section | shall be u | tilized for e | explanation | 1. |
| 1. | agency or organization i a grant application to a t Office of Traffic Safety (on traffic safety goals cle the Department, did the appropriate assistant co | s proposing or has submitted funding agency other than the OTS) that appears to focus early within the jurisdiction of commander notify the mmissioner? | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: Commander did not become aware of another agency/organization submitting a grant application. |
| | Plan, been sought for tra for the purpose of condu engineering studies, sys implementations? | through the Highway Safety iffic safety-related activities cting inventories, need and tem development or program | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No Area grants initiated. |
| 3. | the expenses associated identified by the National Administration? | • | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: Grants provided through GMU |
| 4. | non-reimbursable overtin | other programs or used for ne expenditures? | ⊠ Yes | □No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | Unit (GMU)? | els to Grants Management | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No Area initiated grants. |
| 6. | Was GMU contacted to c personnel billing rates us preparing concept paper | ed for grant projects when | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No Area initiated grants. |

OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

| | 7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"? | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No local grants projects for local benefit. |
|---|--|-------|------|-------|--|
| | 8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate? | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No Area initiated grants. |
| | 9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU? | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No Area initiated grants. |
| * | 10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs? | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No Area initiated grants. |
| | 11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU? | ⊠ Yes | □No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | 12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met? | ⊠ Yes | □No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | 13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project? | ⊠ Yes | □No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | 14. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name? | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No Area initiated grants. |
| • | 15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25? | ☐ Yes | □ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No Area grant funded equipment acquired. |
| | Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement? | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No Area grant funded equipment acquired. |
| | 17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget. | ☐ Yes | □ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No Area applications for Federal Funds. |

OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

| 1 40 |) = = f = d = = 1 Ot = = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 = 1 | | | | |
|--------------|---|---------|------|-------|--|
| | 3. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance? | ☐ Yes | □ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No requests have been made. |
| | D. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act? | ☐ Yes | □ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No requests have been made. |
| |). Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose? | ⊠ Yes | □No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | . Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency? | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No grant related to MCSAP |
| | . Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency? | ☐ Yes | □ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No Area grants for the Homeland Security Grant Program. |
| ~uest | ions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen | nt Unit | | | · · · · · · · |
| | . Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program? | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: Area Office. |
| | Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants? | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: Area Office. |
| | Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project? | ☐ Yes | □No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: Area Office. |
| 26. | Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU? | ☐ Yes | □ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: Area Office. |

JOMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

| Command: Tracy (226) | Division: VALLEY | Number: |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Evaluated by: G. Burlingame, | Date: 02/02/2010 | |
| Assisted by: | | Date: |

| INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------|------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| TYPE O | F INSPECTION | Lead Insp | ector's Signati | ure: | | |
| ☑ Division Level ☐ Command Level | | D. Burgingome | | | | |
| ПЕхе | cutive Office Level [7] Voluntary Self-Inspection | 1). Mogaregonic | | | | |
| | llow-up Required: ☐ Follow-up Inspection | Commander's Signature: Date: | | | | |
| | Yes No | Jul | - + a- | 1 | 2/4/10 | |
| HPM 4 | plicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6, 10.71, Chapters 2, 8, and 10, HPM 10.5, er 2, and HPM 10.3, Chapters 24 and 28. | | | , | | |
| Note: | fa "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section | shall be u | tilized for e | xplanation | l. | |
| 1. | Is the hiring company/agency for reimbursable overtime being held responsible for paying a minimum of four hours of overtime per CHP uniformed employee, regardless of length of service/detail? | ⊠ Yes | □No | □ N/A | Remarks: | |
| 2. | Is a minimum of four hours overtime being allocated to each CHP uniformed employee(s) if cancellation notification is made 24 hours or less prior to the scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed employee(s) cannot be notified of such cancellation? | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks: | |
| 3. | Are reimbursable special project codes being used for all overtime associated with reimbursable special projects? | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks: | |
| 4. | Is the commander ensuring nonuniformed personnel overtime hours are not reflected on the Report of Overtime Hours for Reimbursable Special Projects? | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: No non-uniform overtime allowed except for Reimbursable Special Projects. | |
| 5. | Is the commander ensuring non-reimbursable overtime is not being claimed for an employee, other than Bargaining Unit 7, while on vacation or compensated time off for hours worked during their regular work shift time? | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks: | |
| 6. | Is "RDO" being written in the "Notes" section of the CHP 415, Daly Field Record, for overtime worked on a regular day off? | ☐ Yes | ⊠ No | □ N/A | Remarks: Some overtime worked was in conjunction with beginning of shift. RDO was not written on several others. | |

OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

| | 7. | Is there a CHP 90, Report of Court Appearance - Civil Action, completed for each officer or sergeant when overtime is associated for civil court? | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
|---|-----|---|----------|------|-------|---|
| | | | - | | | |
| | 8. | Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break? | ⊠ Yes | □No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | 9. | Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime? | ⊠ Yes | □No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | | Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters? | ⊠ Yes | □No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | | If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor? | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: |
| _ | | Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415? | ⊠ Yes | ☐ No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | 13. | Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances? | ⊠ Yes | ☐ No | □ N/A | Remarks: Area is aware of max balances and manage it accordingly. |
| | | Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period? | ⊠ Yes | □No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | | Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period? | ⊠ Yes | □No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | | Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)? | ⊠ Yes | ☐ No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | 17. | Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature? | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| | | | | | | |